

Lecture about a book written by Peter Englund, 1993.

Robert Faurisson

My name is Robert Faurisson. I am a professor in France. I am specialised in text and document criticism. Today I would like to talk to you about a book which has been published in Swedish. This book is from Peter Englund. And the title mean "The eternal hatred on neo-Nazism, anti-Semitism and Radio Islam". It has been published in 1993. I do not read myself Swedish. Somebody sent me a translation. And we are going to suppose that the translation is exact. But please remember that it's only a translation. I am going to criticise very strongly Mr Peter Englund. This historian thinks that it is possible to answer to the revisionism challenge. He thinks that the Nazi gas chambers really existed and that it is quite possible to bring evidence after existence of those terrible weapons. The only way to answer our challenge would be, in my mind, to show us or to draw us such a weapon. Mr Peter Englund does not show us, does not draw us any of those gas chambers. But that is what he claims. He claims that if you read carefully what has been written on the extermination camps as we are told, extermination camps means camps where the Jews are put to be exterminated, you can easily have an idea of what it could look like. And he goes as far as to say that he, Mr Peter Englund, he is able to describe for us one camp. And even one day in this camp. This day is the 18th of August 1942. This camp is Belzec. Not to be confused with Bergen-Belsen. Bergen-Belsen is near Hamburg and was liberated by the British. Belzec is situated in south-east of Poland, near the Russian border.

Peter Englund in part of his book tell us: I am going to show you what happen on this very day, in this very camp. But there is something disturbing. It's the beginning of his statements. Because first, he confesses that there is no physical evidence. And as you perhaps know, we revisionism, we are very interested in physics, chemistry, topography, in technical questions. We are as we say, materialistic. We want to see the things or to have those things reconstructed. But in a scientific way. So it's really unfortunately that it is no physical evidence of such a extraordinary thing. But this is what he has to say. He say, not a trace have to be left of Belzec. The camp was demolished, etc, etc. He also says that there is no documentary evidence. That all paper was destroyed. You must understand that for Mr Englund, if there is no physical evidence and if there is no documentary evidence, it's because the Germans are guilty. They destroyed everything. Which is really surprise.

But we are going to do as if Mr Englund was quite right. And we are going to say: Oh there we have a man who is going to tell us what exactly happen one day in one place. Although he has no physical evidence, no documentary evidence. What does he have? He has only what he call testimony evidence. He has what he call witnesses. Unfortunately, if you have no physical evidence and no documentary evidence, it's very difficult for you to see the value of any testimony. You need something material to check what a so call witness is saying.

But anyway, let us go and see. So, so far we see that the lecturer will not bring us any hard evidence. Physical traces of the place. Where the allege crime was committed. Physical existents of the weapon of the crime. Documents of paper about this place. This weapon, this crime. But only testimonies of what he call eye witnesses.

So let us see what suppose to be those eye witnesses. Firstly, Mr Englund said, and he had quit right to say, to remind us that memory is something deceitful. This is said on paged 101. So my question is: How is Mr Englund going to precede in order not to be deceit by something which is sometime deceitful? And there is no answer. We do not know how this Swedish historian checked those testimonies and how he decided, this is a good eye witnesses, this is not a good eye witnesses. He should have done it. More over, he had said of course there are contradiction obscure details and what must be sheer error in those sources that I have used. And he also says I still considered a great number of details to be unclear and worth discussion. But there is no doubt in spite of the differed question of details. And he gives what he call some examples of those details. Now, if I am right, Mr Englund says in all what I am going to tell you is true. But in some details there might be sheer error or things that are obscure or contradicted by someone.

So I would first say something of the choose of this word, details. I Think that a real scientist has no right to say, details. Because details implies a value judgement. It's an opinion. Because what for you, for him I mean, could be a detail, perhaps might be for other people being something more than a detail. And even when you say you implied a non important detail. In other terms in this apparently innocents word, there is a double implication. The detail that he give are some examples. So, how did he choose those examples? Maybe we do not know. He choose pointless and trifling examples instead of more serious examples.

Now regarding the first eye witness, whose name is giving, the German Kurt Gerstein. He says that in the testimony's of that man, there are certain problems. And he give only one example. He says about Kurt Gerstein, especially his unreasonable statement that almost 800 persons where put in a gas chamber of 25 square metres. And of course this will mean almost 32 people in 1 square metre. But I would say, is it unreasonable for an eye witness to say that he has seen such a thing? There is the word unreasonable feet is that what one could call one detail. How many detail of that calibre are there? What is the audience going to with this an order detail later on, when his going to tell us the entire story of what he call the mass gassings in Belzec. Which took place till the middle of December 1942. This is on page 100.

So if I try to make the total of his own critics of those testimonies. I see that Mr Peter Englund had to say all the same that there were certain problems. That something was unreasonable. That there were contradictions. That there were obscure details. Sheer errors. That something was unclear. He also said in footnote number 55, an absurdity which might be seen as an error of thought. Probably also a mistake.

So if I understand we have to be very careful with those witnesses. My question is: Has Mr Peter Englund been as prudent as he says that we have to be? One question: How many witnesses is he evoking? And I could say, 16. Which is very much. And I am going to give you the complete list of those witnesses. So not only his witness nr 1, which is Kurt Gerstein, but and also, Dr Pfannenstiel, but listen: Franz Stangel, Josef Jeklain, Oscar Degelman, Wilhelm Kornides, Adolf Eichmann, Frans Schomell, Josef Oberase, Rudolf Höss, who have been a kommandant of famous Auschwitz camp, August Becker, August Effner, two Poles, Stanislaw Bodenowitz, Jan Karski, and also one Swede Karl-Inge Vendell.

At no point we are giving what those people exactly said about Belzec. Either for have service in the camp which was the case of the Germans, or at least for some of those Germans, or for having seen it from outside, the poles, or for having got intelligence information on it. Which seem to be the case of the Swede. And the lecturer says something else, He says that he has also used as far as the Polish witnesses are concerned a book, written by the communists in 1947. And this is disturbing. Because we have to be extremely prudent with what the communists have published. We do not know how they choose themselves there witnesses. And if there were also sheer errors, mistakes, contradictions and so on.

So this is what we have. But Mr Peter Englund uses a rather bad method I should say. He did something else which is extremely serious and I am going to criticise him very strongly. Let us take an example. His witness, the eye witness number 1. He is the German Kurt Gerstein. But we revisionists we know very well Kurt Gerstein. We have written many things about this witness, so call witness. And this is what surprisingly happen with Mr Peter Englund. In fact Kurt Gerstein said in a statement, that in the Belzec, gas chamber there were 700-800 people in 25 square metres, 45 cubic metres. Which means 28-32 people in 1 square metre and 1 meter 80 of high. Because the people were not piled of on top of the other. They were standing on their feet. So this is an impossible story. But my question is: How is it on page 119 Mr Peter Englund reproducing, suppose to produce what Gerstein had stated put in his mouth those words, 700-800 people about 6 persons per square metre, 6. You understand, 6. Mr Peter Englund consoled the 25 square metres, consoled the 45 cubic metres. He totally change the story.

Let me give you another example. Kurt Gerstein said that in Belzec there was a mountain of clothes of 30 to 40 meters. Which means 10-12 stores. Peter Englund, instead of reproducing this, which is so stupid, because how could you put something, a cloth a piece of cloth on top of 10-12 stores? It is totally impossible. Mr Peter Englund said that Kurt Gerstein had written not a mountain of 30 to 40 meters, but a gigantic mountain. He replaced 30 to 40 meters by gigantic. So if you read this, what is mean gigantic for you? You are left with your imagination. And I could give you plenty of example of the rewriting by Mr Englund of the text of his witness number 1.

Let me tell you what it remind me. In the seventeenth century our king Louis the 14th had a son and the son was call 'dolphin'. And when the king decided that his son would have to learn Latin, his son was not given original Latin text. Because as you perhaps know that in original Latin text you might have some, I would say, strong passages that a child should not read. So special books were printed for the 'dolphin'. And they were call the books 'For the used of dolphin'. This was the name given to the expurgated version of the Latin classical text that Louis the 14th got printed for the use of his son. But the French people today use this expurgated version, this 'For the used of dolphin' as it was original. This text which has been transformed or falsified. So this is exactly what Mr Englund did.

He did something else. He hid that there were many different versions of the gassings in Belzec. In the Gerstein version we are suppose to believe that the people were killed by the gas of a diesel motor. It is really stupid because diesel has very little of CO and very much of CO2 and the gas which really kill is CO.

But anyway, what Mr Englund did not say is that for many so call witness people in Belzec were killed for instance by electricity. It was the version at the Nürnberg-trial. The most pro-hid version of Belzec story was that in this camp Jewish were killed by electricity. Those testimonies, so call, are ignored or not mention by Mr Englund. Why? What does he not mentions also that?

For Leib Langfus in a book written by Bere Mark and republished in 1982, two methods were used in this camp to kill the Jews. Excuse me, but believe me, the first method was suffocation by shit. The Jews were suppose to be put in pits, individual pits and the other Jews had to relieve on the fellow Jew. And the Jew in the pit was killed by shit. The second method was electricity.

How is it that Mr Peter Englund has not mentioned the version of the man call Stefan Szende? He was a Jew. This version was first published in Sweden. And this extraordinary version say that the Jews were put in a very big room on a metallic platform. And the metallic platform would go down. The water would come. And when the Jews had water over there legs the electrify current was put in the water. And the Jews were electrocuted. Than the metallic platform would rise up and then the electricity would be put once more. And this platform would get red and the Jews would be burned. And even incinerated. This is the version of Szende published in Sweden in 1944. Mr Peter Englund does not say that.

According to the international military tribunal at Nürnberg 1945-1946 the only version is killing by electricity. The Soviet and the British prosecution mention about it in document from the Polish government in London. And this was the truth in Nürnberg. Why does Peter Englund not mention this? And what about the non cross examination of Dr Hans Frank? He was accused. Who said that during the war he had heard a rumour about Belzec. Then he visited the place. And according to what he said in Nürnberg he didn't see anything wrong. Perhaps Dr Frank is lying. But we have to mention this. According to the Oberhause of trial the story of the killing is that first Zyklon B was used and then exhausted gas of a Diesel motor. And this does not fit at all with the Gerstein version. Which said first diesel motor and then possible of using Zyklon B.

If you see the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* published in 1971. And the *Encyclopaedia of Holocaust* published in 1990. You will see what they

say about Belzec in the article Belzec. Now listen, first: "The absence of survivors and the paucity of German documents referring to Belzec make a detailed history of the camp impossible". So, according to *Encyclopaedia Judaica* who have studied all the books, articles that have been published on Belzec: It's impossible to make a detailed history of the camp. How could Peter Englund suddenly discover the possibility of making such a detailed history of this camp, that he is able to make this story of one day of the entire story of this camp? This day is being the 18th of August, 1942. *The Encyclopaedia of Holocaust* said: "Apart from this one source", meaning the Reder source, which has absolutely no value, but anyway, "Apart from this one source information on Belzec has been difficult to come by compared with evidence on the other extermination camps". Now this is not correct at all about the other extermination camps. But we do not mind for the present time. This one source is Rudolf Reder booklet. This sentence was written by Itzac Rad, in this *Encyclopaedia*. But Mr Peter Englund knows the name of Itzac Rad. Because he mentions him in a footnote I think. So how is it that Mr Rad who of course mention Gerstein in his book, does not mention him at the end of the article Belze?.

Among the people named by Peter Englund, you remember certainly the name of Kornides. But go and see what Kornides wrote. Kornides in fact said that he was in a train. That from the train he saw the camp of Belzec. But he could not see what was inside the camp. He said that he could not see anything. So how could it be, how could Kornides be considers as an eye-witness? This so call eye-witness said, I did not see. So he certainly not an eye-witness.

About Franz Stangl, do you know that in fact Franz Stangl didn't see anything precise about Belzec? And you should read very carefully the book that Gitta Sereny Honeyman wrote about Stangl. The title is "Into that darkness". I may myself ask to Gitta Sereny: "But how is it that you didn't ask any question, about the mechanic of the gassing in this camps?" And she replied, but of course he would have denied that there were gas chamber. So how could it be an eye-witness considered that in this book of Gitta Sereny Honeyman, Stangl doesn't say anything about that?

Why did Mr Englund hid that the revisionists wrote very much about Gerstein, Pfannenstihl, Reder? If Peter Englund had wanted to demonstrate that the revisionists are wrong, he should not have contented himself with vague accusations against revisionism. He should have laid precise accusations about the way Faurisson, Mattogno and many others treated the matter of Belzec. Why does Peter Englund not even mention those revisionists works of Gerstein or of Belzec?

How is it that Mr Peter Englund does not say anything about what Raul Hilberg said on Gerstein? Now Raul Hilberg is what we call the pope of exterminations. He is the most important historian. The historian number one of the so call Holocaust. He wrote his famous book with the title "The destruction of the European Jews". But when Mr Hilberg in a trial in Toronto in 1985 was cross-examined, it was a total disaster for him. And especially about Gerstein. He had to totally retreat from his position about Gerstein. And I would like to know how Peter Englund would have answered to the questions I put throw the lawyer, to Raul Hilberg in this cross-examination. I will try to give you in few minutes some of the statement that Raul Hilberg had to make about Gerstein. About the eye-witnesses mention by Peter Englund there is Jan Karski. But never ever we are told that according to Jan Karski in 1944, the Jews in Belzec were killed not by Diesel-motor, not by electricity, not by shit but by quicklime. Yes quicklime in a train. That is surprisingly in 1987. Because of the pressure of him of the revisionists Jan Karsiki in an interview said I that that Belzec was a transitory camp. It was after the war that I learn that it was a death camp. I could not see the gas chambers. So how could he be an eye-witness? In a book in 1987 you will see what he had to say about many witnesses mentioned by Peter Englund.

And coming to Rudolf Höss he in fact was never in Belzec. He mentioned the camp of Belzec once. And he said Belzec and Wolzec in 1941. But you must know that in 1941 there was no extermination camps as we say in Belzec. And that Wolzek never existed.

As for Eichmann he said in his trial that he had never seen a gas chamber. Maybe it is a lie. But Mr Peter Englund have no right to say that Eichmann was an eye-witness in Belzec.

Quite recently the revisionist Jürgen Graf, he is a Swiss, he is a professor, he made the fan of the story of Belzec by just placing side by side different version of the witnesses. His book was published in 1990 in German. In 1993 in French.

Now to begin with in what Peter Englund wrote, there is no physical representation of the camp or of the gas chambers. What appears on page 107 and 117 comes out of the blue. There are pure attempt of illustration very vaguely what a witness said or suppose to have said. A drawing or a very vague drawing or a sketch, is not proof what so ever. In fact this drawing or this sketch is a kind of illustration of what Gerstein said. It's not a proof that Gerstein was right. Let me make it more clear. Gerstein wrote something about Belzec. Then some people try to make a drawing from that. So the drawing does not proof anything about the truth of what Gerstein says. It is only a very big illustration.

I would have many other things to say. And you see as I am a professor fortunately. And that in my life I had very often to give a mark to the essays of my students. I wanted to put a mark to what Mr Englund had written. You must know that in France the marks go from 0, when it is very bad, to 20 when it's very good. And let me tell you that I have giving a mark to Mr Peter Englund. A mark is of course a judgement. So let me give you first the mark: The mark is 2 on 20. And this is my judgement: This work by Mr Peter Englund is a pious attempt as a novelist would do it. A nonsense-second story, in order to present it as a sensible and valuable peace of history. That attempt demanded considerable transformation of a original text. And concealment of documents. Especially of the Nürnberg Trial documents pertaining to Belzec. Mr Peter Englund ignores or concealed the existence of encyclopaedias, books and articles. Both of revisionists or non-revisionists. On the matter he pretends to trip as an historian solely concerned with historical sources. I repeat my mark would be 2 on the 0 to 20 scale of marks.

I would like to add something about professor Raul Hilberg. The other as I told you "The destruction of the European Jews." First published in 1961. And then in 1985. A new version, in 3 volumes. At the trial of Ernst Zündel in 1985 in Toronto Canada, Raul Hilberg testified against Zündel, who is a revisionist. And I was in charged of helping the defence-layer of Ernst Zündel. He's name being Douglas Christie. And we had prepared some questions for Mr Hilberg who came very, very sure of himself. And he was really defeated by the cross-examinations. So much defeated that he refused in 1988 to come back for another trial.

We asked Mr Hilberg: So in your book you are quoting Gerstein. And immediately he tried to say: Oh but to Gerstein is not very important. And we said: Now do you know how many times you quoted Gerstein? He had quoted him 23 times.

So Gerstein was really a witness number 1, until 1985. His testimonies were totally destroyed in a thesis presented by Henri Roques in France. And I am going to read you some samples of the answers of Raul Hilberg, when he was cross-examined by Douglas Christie on Gerstein. Those are quotations taken from the transcript of the trial.

This is Raul Hilberg talking: I would put Gerstein's statement PS-1553 as one that one must be most careful about. Parts are collaborated, others are pure nonsense. Second quotations: Gerstein apparently was a very excitable person. He was capable of all kinds of statements which he indeed made not only in the affidavit but in its context. Now, question from Douglas Christie: Gerstein wasn't totally insane? Answer from Raul Hilberg: I am not a judge of insanity but I would be careful about what he said. Something more from Raul Hilberg: Gerstein was capable in his excitement of adding imagination to fact. There is no question of that. Question from Douglas Christie to Raul Hilberg: And we know that Gerstein's statement that Hitler was there in Belzec on this day to be a totally false statement. Right? Answer from Hilberg: Exactly. From Hilberg: Well, the reproductions of his statements, I eliminated anything that seemed not to be plausible or credible certainly.

Now let me make a commentary about this. This is exactly what Mr Peter Englund did. This is the 'For the used of dolphin'-way of free writing text.

Something else from Hilberg about another statement: Well, parts of it are true and other parts of it are sheer exaggerations, manifest, obvious exaggerations, rhetoric. Another thing: Gerstein was someone who was given to great excitability. Or: I would not consider him as totally irrational, but that is no value because I am not an expert of rationality. Question from the defence-layer: A very strange mind prone to exaggeration. Answer from Raul Hilberg: Yes. And somewhere else Hilberg says: A far-out statement. And also he says: In the use of such garbage one must be extraordinary careful.

So this is what Raul Hilberg says about the witness number 1, and I would say the only witness of Mr Englund. I would like now to treat another question. Related all the same to all this. It is the question of the so-called eye-witnesses. We are prone to believe that about the gas chamber we have many witnesses. Now do you know that in fact we have exactly 0 witness. Because what is a witness? It's not somebody coming and saying that he is a witness. It is somebody who has been cross-examined in a court about what he claims having seen. And the cross-examination is a very difficult trial for those people. And for something like half a century, do you know that not one witness has been cross-examined on the very facts of the gassings. I have to correct myself. This happens only once. It was precisely in 1985 at the famous first Zündel-trial in Toronto, Canada. For the first time a so-called witness was really cross-examined. His name was Doctor Rudolf Vrba. He was at the origin of the story of gassings in Auschwitz. And we are successful enough to see him on the witness-stamp. And to ask him some questions. Vrba, this man was asked questions on a statement he had done in 1944. When he was on the witness-stand he confirmed his statement about gassings in Auschwitz. And he said that every word was true, exact. But when the time of cross-examinations came he had to confess that in fact he had invented many things. And he said that he had used "poetic license". Even he said it in Latin. He said "licencia poetarum". The license of the poets. And it was a terrible thing for him. When he went away the man was totally destroyed.

So you see, the best possible witness was Rudolf Vrba. And he had to confess that in fact he had lied. And the same thing for the best possible historian, Raul Hilberg.

This is why I insist always very much on this trial of 1985. Because for the first time the best possible historians and the best possible witness were interacted and it was a disaster for the historian Raul Hilberg and for the witness Rudolf Vrba.

But I would have many other things to say about the testimonies. Sometimes in courts, in French courts, I see some Jew coming to me and saying: Now Mr Faurisson, how dare you say that those gas chambers never existed? I was myself in Auschwitz. See my tattoo number. And every time I say: Now look me in the eyes. And answer my questions. If you maintain that the gas chambers existed. That the gassing operations existed. Please describe. Don't be vague. Describe. And every time the answer is: Oh, but if I had attended this I wouldn't be alive today to talk to you. And my common answer about that is that there we have a liar. A man or a woman who try to impress me. It is a little bit the story of the fisherman who says this morning I have caught a fish of 200 pounds. And if you do not believe me I show you the place. But I am not interested by the place. I am interested by the extraordinary fish.

The witness now a days who is very often quoted is Elie Wiesel. You should read the book of Elie Wiesel. His book was published first in French. The title being "Night". Now do you know that if you read carefully this book, you will learn this: When he was 15-16 years old he was in the death-camp, the extermination-camp with his father. And at the end, when the Russians troops approached Auschwitz, he was left, and his father also was left with a choice given by the Germans. Either you stay in Auschwitz or you come with us inside Germany. So my question to this extraordinary witness, Elie Wiesel would be: Now please explain me, how is it that according to your own words the choice between waiting for the Russians, liberators or going away with the Germans, exterminators, how is it that you choose the German exterminators? What is this? And do you know that in this book never he mentions gas chambers. He said that people were killed by fire in Auschwitz. There were burned on pits. No question of gas chamber.

Another man, sometimes mentioned, a so-called eye-witness is Primo Levi, an Italian Jew. He wrote a rather interesting book in 1947. And in this book you will notice that 5 times he used the word gas chamber, singular, not plural, singular. And he said that himself he had not seen any gas chamber. That he learned the existence of the gas chambers after the war. And that in Auschwitz people used to talk about the gas chamber. But nobody had seen it. So Primo Levi cannot be an eye-witness. According to what he said himself.

Strangely enough, in 1976 he published, he republished his texts of 1947. And he added a preface. And in his preface, he used 11 times, I

think the words gas chambers, plural. And this time he spoke about those gas chambers exactly as if he had been an eye-witness. So this is a damned lie. And we should know that we have like that witness of everything. And in experience especially recently in Demjanjuk-trial, were those testimonies of the man call Eliahu Rosenberg, who in 1947 had written that he had attended the death of a man that he call Ivan the terrible. And then after in the trial in Jerusalem he said: Demjanjuk is this man.

So there are so many contradictions, so many lies that we have to be very careful. What is the best way to judge, to check a testimony? It is to have what we call material evidence, hard evidence. Let me take an example about the value that we can give to testimonies on one side and to hard evidence on the other side. If somebody says: Oh this man, this very day drank 2 litres of wines, schnaps and so on. If you have 5 or 6 witnesses stating this and if on the other hand you have an expertise showing that in fact there was no trace of alcohol in the blood of this person, accused of having drunk, what do you expect the judge will do? He will say: I do not care for the 5 witness. I have to care for the hard evidence, for the alcoholic test.

And this is what we have to do in this very fast problem of the gas chambers. We have to ask and ask and ask for hard evidence. And we don't have any hard evidence. Because, simply I can tell you those so-called gas chambers are a total physical and chemical impossibility. But I am not going to demonstrate it right know. I think that the next time I will have the opportunity to talk to you, I will say something about a book who is making in France a big hullabaloo, as we say. It's a book from a pharmacist call Jean-Claude Pressac. The title strangely is "The crematory of Auschwitz". And we are told by the journalists and by Pressac himself in an interview that he is presenting now, only now the proof that there were homicidal gas chambers in Auschwitz. And if you read the book, this is really a false. Already in 1989 Pressac had published a big fat book in English. The title was "Auschwitz, technical operations of the gas chambers". We revisionists wrote many things about this big fat book. In which you will find the evidence that in Auschwitz you certainly had crematories, ovens, gassing for disinfecting, all sorts of buildings, all sorts of barracks, of hospital and so on. And this about Zyklon B which was a product for disinfecting. But there is not the slightest proof of the existents of even one gas chamber in Auschwitz. In his 1989-book with this strange title "Auschwitz, technical operation of the gas chambers", even Pressac doesn't say that he has found a proof. He said that he has found pieces of proofs, traces, criminal traces. So Pressac wants to intimidate you by saying: You see if I take one quarter of a proof, plus one quarter of a proof, plus one half of a proof I have one proof. I am sorry. A quarter of a proof is not a proof. Half a proof is not a proof.

So, in this book you don't have anything. And in the new book, the little book published this year in France, you have nothing more. You have the demonstrations that there were crematories. Of course there were crematories. The Germans really needed them, specially because in Auschwitz you had so many typhus epidemics. And it was no question of bury those people. Because the water-level was so high in Auschwitz. And if you put dead bodies in this water, everything will be infected. So there were in Auschwitz ovens, there were gas chambers for disinfecting. But there was no homicidal gas chamber. We had said that for many, many years when we finally got expertise from a man called Fred Leuchter, then from a man called Germar Rudolf, then from a man called Walter Lüftl. And if you want to say anything about Auschwitz you have to begin by reading those expertise. Which is strange, that we had to wait such a long time to have an expert-report on a weapon that nobody has ever seen.

Make this little experience. If you want to know what is a table, a chair, a locomotive, an atomic-weapon, anything. Either you can see, either you can go and see in books, encyclopaedic, photos, descriptions, explanations of the technique of the operations of those things like atomic-weapon. But when it comes to this extraordinary weapon invented by the Germans in the 40th. I mean the German, the Nazi gas chamber, you don't find anything, nothing at all. And this is why I come back constantly to the challenge I made in Stockholm on the 17th of Mars 1992, when I said to those journalists who wanted to ask me questions, I said: I have no questions to answer. I have an statement to make and I have even a challenge to made. Which is, show me or draw me a Nazi gas chamber. And after we discuss the matter. This is the beginning. But as everyone knows, it is very difficult to begin by the beginning. At least sometimes.

So this was about Mr Peter Englund, and also about generally speaking in the testimonies of Holocaust.

From a tape with R. Faurisson recorded in Stockholm, May 1993, and displayed on "Radio-Islam" website. Remember it is an oral presentation.

| Index historia | |Svenska huvudsidan | | Andra språk |

We have edited some minor mistakes.

First displayed on aaargh: 12 April 2001.

This text has been displayed on the Net, and forwarded to you as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Recits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (AAARGH). The E-mail of the Secretariat is <[\[email protected\]](#)>. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA..

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in thoses places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by the Human Rights Charter:

ARTICLE 19. <Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.

[\[email protected\]](#)

